

TOPO Monthly Invoice Verification Form

Please Return the Forms to Meiling Lincoff (SFD-2) by: **MONDAY, 10/31/16**

Date of the Monthly Progress Reports and Invoices Sent to TOPO: 10/20/16

Contractor: CH2M HILL	Contract No.: EP-S9-08-04	Period of Performance for This Invoice: 08/27/16 - 09/30/16
--------------------------	------------------------------	--

Invoice No.: 92	Amount: \$6,332.55
-----------------	--------------------

TOPO: David Seter	Contract PO: Meiling Lincoff
-------------------	------------------------------

TO No.: 012-RSBD-09GU	Site Name: Anaconda Copper Mine
-----------------------	---------------------------------

Voucher Overview also including Reviewing Summary of Costs by Task: Please mark Y (Yes), or N (No), or NA and provide written explanations when answers are “no.”

- ☐ Y 1. Are specific costs correctly broken down, accumulated, and billed?
- ☐ Y 2. Does the invoice period of performance (PoP) cover the progress report PoP?
- ☐ Y 3. Are the billed costs authorized by the task order workplan?
- ☐ Y 4. Is the math accurate?
- ☐ Y 5. Are the accumulated costs and level of effort invoiced within the estimates of the approved workplan?

Labor

- ☐ Y 6. Is the labor mix consistent with the workplan?
- ☐ Y 7. Are the labor hours commensurate with work completed in PoP?
- ☐ Y 8. Are the labor categories similar to the last PoP?
- ☐ NA 9. If not, is there an appropriate rationale for the change?
- ☐ NA 10. Were billed premiums for overtime authorized by the CO or allowable in the contract?

Other Direct Costs

- ☐ NA 11. Was CO's consent for any charges for subcontractors received in advance?
- ☐ NA 12. Is the level of subcontract effort charged commensurate with the level of progress made?
- ☐ NA 13. Do travel expenses appear reasonable and within the approved budget?
- ☐ NA 14. Do supply and material costs appear appropriate for the tasks completed this month?
- ☐ NA 15. Did equipment purchase have prior CO approval as required by property procedures?
- ☐ NA 16. If present, does the amount of ALL other direct costs seem reasonable and commensurate with the work performed?

Please check one of the statements below and provide verification signature. Keep the invoice and monthly report for your record. **If there is any unreasonable and/or confusing information, please send your request for explanation/clarification through an email to the contractor and always include Maria Velez and Meiling Lincoff in the “cc.”**

- ☐ Y I agree with this invoice. Sufficient progress has been made by the contractor to support payment of the work performed.
- ☐ Contractor must provide additional justification for verification of costs and/or hours on this task order.
- ☐ Cost listed below should be withheld since they cannot be verified.

Comments/Explanation:

Mandatory TOPO Monthly Performance Evaluation Form

Please rate each criterion and provide positive feedback or problem areas that need to be addressed.

The minimum acceptable rating is "Good." The rating below "Good" or any problem areas indicated below should be addressed immediately by Project Officer and contractor Program Manager.

5 – Outstanding 4 – Excellent 3 – Good 2 – Fair 1 – Poor 0 - Unsatisfactory

Quality of Services Delivered

Rating: 4

CH2M delivered excellent quality in revisions to the Historical Summary Report which is an important and complex document highlighting the timeline of events at the site and inventorying potential contamination sources. The quality of the first draft was excellent as were the revisions.

Effectiveness of Management

Rating: 4

CH2M provided an excellent level of service in effectively managing revisions to the Historical Summary Report to meet EPA's time line for completing a draft. The CH2M PO has been effective in communicating with the EPA TOPO with just the right level of input requested / needed from EPA to complete the task.

Initiative in Meeting Contract Requirement

Rating: 4

CH2M has been effective and looking at the big picture for this project and as a result has performed in an excellent fashion demonstrating the initiative to identify issues that need to be discussed so that they don't end up being road blocks or speed bumps. CH2M worked independently and effectively on major sections of the Historical Summary Report.

Timeliness of Performance

Rating: 3

CH2M responded in a relatively timely fashion to EPA's need for revisions to the Historical Summary Report with the one limitation being the speed with which they were able to change one of the figures in the document. Admittedly though this figure is quite complex therefore CH2M is still rated good under this criteria.

Cost Control

Rating: 4

CH2M has assigned the appropriate level staff for appropriate levels of time to tasks including the Historical Summary Report with the result being they have done an excellent job at utilizing resources to the minimum extent necessary and thus conserving resources for work that will need to be completed before the end of the task order.

Business Practices

Rating: 4

Because CH2M has communicated effectively, been proactive, and used resources wisely they have demonstrated excellent business practices. The Historical Summary Report is a good example of this as an important reference document for EPA staff but one which could eat up too many resources if not controlled in the way CH2M controlled work on the task.

Customer Satisfaction

Rating 4

Because of CH2M's good timeliness of performance resulting in excellent work product in the form of the Historical Summary Report, which resulted from excellent communication and business practice, CH2M is given a rating of excellent under the customer satisfaction category.

Signature & Date:

I have reviewed the monthly progress and financial reports and verify to the best of my ability the costs incurred.